REMARKS

Status of the Claims

The Office Action mailed January 7, 2009 noted that claims 1-8 were pending and rejected all claims. No claims are amended. No claims are cancelled. No new claims are added. No new matter is believed to be presented.

Claims 1-8 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. The rejection is traversed below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action, on page 2, rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Low et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087708). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Low discusses a "super packet" which is a number of single packets which are preceded by a special header. The special header includes the ID of a processor for additional processing of the packet along with a job ID and other relevant parameters. In other words, each super packet has additional header information. This super packet is handled by a number of processors until all jobs are completed. One such job is payload encryption. Thus, according to Low, each packet is separately encrypted. Low also notes that to transmit the packets in the super packet, it must be decompiled down into a number of unique packets to be transmitted via different ports/links. (See Low, Figure 6, paragraphs [0049], [0053], [0055]-[0059]).

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that nothing cited or found in Low discusses the following features recited, for example, in claim 1:

> forming collective Internet Protocol data packets, each containing several Internet Protocol data packets of different communication data streams;
>
> **encrypting each collective Internet Protocol data packet by an encryption module to form encrypted collective Internet Protocol data packets**.

Low is unrelated to and does not discuss the above features. The above features, rather are related to reducing a load on a processor by only encrypting a single collective IP data packet formed of a number of IP data packets, which saves on the computationally expensive preparation of encryption because it is only carried out once as recited in claim 1 "**encrypting each collective Internet Protocol data packet** by an encryption module to form encrypted

collective Internet Protocol data packets." (See Application, paragraph [0027]). Rather, in Low, each individual packet is encrypted as shown in Figures 9a-9c. Thus, the features of claim 1 relate only to a single encryption, rather than encrypting many times as in Low. Furthermore, in Low, the header is encrypted along with data, unlike as recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 5 patentably distinguishes over Low, because nothing cited or found in Low discusses:

> a collective packet generator forming collective Internet Protocol data packets, each containing several Internet Protocol data packets of different communication data streams;
>
> **an encryption module encrypting at least one of the collective Internet Protocol data packets.**

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over Low for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not disclosed by Low. For example, claim 4 recites "determining and forming are performed on the Internet Protocol data packets of the different communication data streams that occur within a specified time interval." In particular, the Office Action admits on page 3 that Low "**does not disclose** the time interval for receiving packet to be encrypted." It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over Low.

In view of the above, Applications request the rejection be withdrawn.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5-6-09

By: _John R. Bednarz_
John R. Bednarz
Registration No. 62,168

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501